PR 92-268

ASSOCIATED PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATION OFFICERS, INC. NORTHERN CALIFORNIA CHAPTER APCO

RICHARD SHELDREW, COORDINATOR
NEVADA (EXCEPT FIRE)
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DIVISION
2525 SOUTH CARSON STREET
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710
PHONE (702) 687-4240
FAX (702) 687-6788

March 23, 1992

Ms. Donna Searcy
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Ms. Searcy:

As chairperson of the Region 27 National Public Safety Planning Advisory Committee (NPSPAC), I am proud to present for your consideration our committee's Frequency Utilization Plan for the State of Nevada formulated in accordance with FCC Dockets 87-112 and 87-359.

On February 28, 1988 the Region 27 convener issued a Public Notice that an initial Region 27 Public Safety Planning meeting would be held on March 8, 1988 at the Nevada Legislature, Room 131. (See Section 3). This initial regional planning meeting officially established the Region 27 Planning Committee and its Subregions with Richard Sheldrew elected as Chairperson by the quorum. Participants in that meeting represented Public Safety Radio Services, Special Emergency Radio Service and Vendor Community. Please note that the vendors participation was encouraged, but they were not allowed to vote.

On December 27, 1991, I mailed the final draft to all entities on the list and provided to all nonparticipating parties requesting copies.

The Final acceptance meetings were held on January 16, 1992 and February 4, 1992.

This final document is outstanding proof that a diverse group of individuals and organizations ranging from Police, Fire, Federal Government, State Government, Local Government, Emergency Management can work together effectively for the good of the community and citizens they serve.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Richard Sheldrew

Richard Sheldrew, Chairperson
Region 27
State of Nevada

(v) 702/687-4240
(f) 702/687-6788
FTS 469-7035

RS:jp

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

REGION 27

State of Nevada

800 Mhz

COMMUNICATION PLAN

SECTION 1

OVERVIEW

Region 27
State of Nevada

SECTION TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE

OVERVIEW 1-2

INTRODUCTION 1-2
SCOPE 1-2
BACKGROUND 1-2
REGIONAL PLANNING METHODOLOGY 1-4
SUMMARY OF PLAN ELEMENTS 1-5

2 CHANNELING PLAN 2-1

ELIGIBLES DEFINED 2-2
REGIONAL PROFILE 2-2
SPECTRUM ALLOTMENT METHODOLOGY 2-4
REQUIREMENTS ASSESSMENT 2-4
PRIORITIZATION PROCEDURES 2-7
ADJACENT REGION COORDINATION PROCEDURES 2-8
DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SPECTRUM ALLOCATIONS 2-9
FREQUENCY REQUESTS AND COORDINATION 2-15
APPLICATION EVALUATION PROCEDURES 2-15
APPEALS PROCEDURE 2-18
CHANNEL ALLOCATIONS 2-19

3 MUTUAL AID CHANNELS AND USAGE 3-1

NATIONAL MUTUAL AID CHANNELS 3-1
STATE MUTUAL AID CHANNELS 3-2
NATIONAL AND STATE MUTUAL AID CHANNEL LISTING 3-3
LICENSING AND INTENDED USE. 3-3
NATIONAL CALLING CHANNEL 3-4
CALLING CHANNEL MONITORING AGENCIES 3-4
RADIO CODES 3-5
CODED SQUELCH 3-5
VOICE PRIVACY, PAGING, ALERTING, SIGNALLING 3-5
UNIT IDENTIFICATION 3-5
OPERATION IN AIRCRAFT 3-5
CROSS BAND REPEATING OR LINKING 3-5
GRANDFATHERED EQUIPMENT 3-6
FEDERAL INTEROPERABILITY 3-6

4 REGION 27 PLAN MODIFICATION 4-1

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES 5-1

OVERVIEW

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This plan has been developed in accordance with Federal Communications Commission Docket 87-112, by a representative group of the Public Safety/Special Emergency Services within the State of Nevada.

1.2 SCOPE

The scope of the plan is to provide a Public Safety radio frequency allocation process that meets the following two objectives:

1. Facilitate interoperability between communications systems to permit local, state, and federal agencies to coordinate their activities.

2. Ensure efficient use of the radio spectrum allocated for public safety.

BACKGROUND

In December 1983, the United States Congress directed the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to establish a plan to ensure that the communications needs of state and local public safety agencies would be met. To help meet this congressional mandate, the FCC established the National Public Safety Planning Advisory Committee (NPSPAC) and chartered this committee to:

(a) identify communications requirements of public safety services;

(b) develop a scheme for efficient use of the newly allocated frequencies at 821-825 MHz and 866-870 Mhz for public safety use nationwide.

(c) develop a scheme to increase utility of existing public safety frequencies; (d) recommend the manner in which new technologies can be applied to public safety frequencies; and

(d) recommend guidelines to ensure compliance with the National Plan.

ith open membership, NPSPAC provided the opportunity for the public safety community and other interested members of the public sector to participate in the overall spectrum management approach by recommending policy guidelines, technical standards, and procedures to satisfy public safety needs for the foreseeable future.

After consideration of NPSPAC's Final Report and comments filed in Docket No. 87-112, a Report and Order was released by the FCC in December 1987 which established a structure for the National Plan that included guidelines for the development of regional plans.

The National Plan reflects the FCC's regulatory objective of maximizing spectrum efficiency and ensuring sufficient flexibility to accommodate specific communications requirements in different areas of the United States. The National Plan serves as an umbrella under which regional plans can be developed and implemented.

1.4 REGIONAL PLANNING METHODOLOGY

UTHORITY

Authority for the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) to carry out its assigned tasks was derived from the FCC Report and Order, Docket 87-112. Participants in the formation of the RPC represent interested personnel from public safety and special emergency radio services. This section will cover the method used to create the Plan, the composition of the committees, and the intended method of administering the Plan.

Upon approval of this plan by the Federal Communications Commission, the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) will become the Regional Review Committee (RRC)

The development of the Public Safety Communications Plan for Region 27 has followed the requirements of the FCC's Report and Order as issued Docket 87-112. It is not the intent of this Plan to conflict with any current or future rule or regulation of the National Plan as may be applicable by Report and Order of the FCC. In such cases where conflict may exist, FCC rules and regulations shall prevail. Elements of this Plan not expressly prohibited by the FCC shall become applicable to Region 27 upon the Plan's

approval by the FCC. Should certain determinations by the FCC void any individual element of this plan, all other elements shall remain applicable.

1.5 REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

In accordance with Docket 87-112, the Associated Public Safety Communications Officers, Inc. (APCO) recommended to the FCC the appointment of a "Convener" for Nevada Region 27. Following statewide public notification of eligibles, the first meeting was held in the state capitol in Carson City. A copy of the letter of notification and list of attendees in shown in Attachments 3 and 4. A Convener for Region 27 was elected and serves as committee chairperson. The state was divided into three sub-regions and three sub-regional chairpersons were elected. The committee chairperson and sub-regional chairpersons also served on the working committee. Their names and a state map depicting the sub-regions are contained in Attachment 5 and 6, respectively.

Due to the large land area of Region 27, travel distances and budget constraints precluded large-scale, joint regional meetings of all public safety eligibles, as originally planned. Therefore, in order to meet the intent of Docket 87-112 and to attain better *statewide representation*, it was necessary for the committee chairperson and the state's 800 MHz project engineer to travel to each county to hold meetings with local representatives. This proved to be more effective and *resulted in greater representation than would have occurred otherwise*. Additional meetings were also held at the state level with state agency personnel.

Using the input from these representatives, the working committee developed the initial and final stages of the plan for review. In all, 42 separate meetings were held statewide with representatives from state agencies, counties, cities, special districts, and special emergency. More than 130 public safety, special emergency, and other officials participated in the plan development process. Attachment 7 contains the names, organizational affiliations, mailing addresses, and telephone numbers of those individuals instrumental in the Plan's formation. These representatives are all considered members of the Regional Planning Committee. Any changes or modifications will be accomplished by an equal and broad base of Region 27 eligibles in accordance with Section 4 of this plan.

1.6 SUMMARY OF PLAN ELEMENTS

Review of Docket 87-112 shows that four major products have been requested of Region 27 by the FCC.
They are:

* A channeling plan showing allocation of the NPSPAC frequencies in accordance with procedures and requirements of Docket 87-112.

* Explanation of operational issues dealing with the mutual aid channels.

* Establishment of procedures to modify the Region 27 Plan.

* Discussion and response to section V. Miscellaneous issues.

SECTION 2

CHANNELING PLAN

Region 27
State of Nevada

SECTION 2
CHANNELING PLAN

Docket 87-112 requires that a channeling plan allocating the NPSPAC frequencies be developed by each region.

As stated under III. Structure of the National Plan, section C. Common Elements of Regional Plans, the intent is to ensure that the National Plan encourages the most efficient utilization of the available spectrum and fosters interoperability between users. To accomplish this, it was necessary for the FCC to establish minimal technical standards the regional plans must follow.

In addition, requirements on how the channeling plan is developed is provided in Docket 87-112 under section IV. Implementation of the Plan, subsection C. Contents of Regional Plans, elements 5 through 9. They are:

(5) a general description of how the spectrum is to be allotted among the various eligible users within the region;

(6) an explanation of how the requirements of all eligible entities within the region were considered and met to the degree possible;

(7) an explanation as to how eligible entities have been prioritized in areas where not all can receive licenses.

(8) an explanation of how the plan has been coordinated with adjacent regions;

(9) a detailed description of how the plan puts the spectrum to the best possible use by requiring system design with minimum coverage areas, by assigning frequencies so that maximum frequency reuse and offset channel use may be made, by using trunking, and by requiring small entities with minimal requirements to join together on a single system where possible.

ELIGIBLES DEFINED

The Region 27 Planning Committee considers all eligibles listed under Federal Communications Commission Rules and Regulations Part 90, Subparts B, and C as Region 27 eligibles. This will include Subpart B eligibles of Local Government, Police, Fire, Highway Maintenance and Forestry-Conservation, and subpart C eligibles to include medical services, rescue organizations, veterinarians, disaster relief organizations, school buses, beach patrols, and communications standby facilities.

2.2 REGIONAL PROFILE

A. Geography

The State of Nevada is defined as Region 27. It has an area of 110,540 square miles. Its geography consists of longitudinal mountain ranges with elevations from 3,000 to 12,000. These mountain ranges are nominally separated by valley floors between 20 to 50 miles wide with elevations 490 to 6,000 ft. These mountain ranges provide communications sites that average greater then 2500 ft. above average terrain (ATT). The topography varies from large desert areas with sparse foliation at lower elevations to medium forested areas at higher elevations. It is bordered on the north by Oregon and Idaho, on the east by Utah, on the south by Arizona, and on the west by California. The distance from the northern border to the southern tip is approximately 500 miles and from the eastern border to the west 408 miles. Attachment 1 contains a map showing the 17 counties and county seats.

The variations in topography and population greatly affect the public safety communications requirements and system design. The uniqueness of a given area dictates the type of system best suited for public safety and special emergency operation. This Plan, its administration, and execution will reflect these considerations.

B. Population

The current population of the State is approximately 1,100,000 with the highest population density in the two major urban areas of Las Vegas/North Las Vegas/Henderson in the south and Reno/Sparks/Carson City in the north. The fastest population growth is occurring in the greater Las Vegas urban

rea of Clark County. The 1985 Clark County population was 767,890; the rrent population is over 815,000 and the projection for the year 2000 is 1,069,000. Washoe County, the second most populus area, is expected to increase from 264,000 in 1990 to 364,000 by the year 2000. The remainder of the state is rather sparsely populated and basically rural in nature. A statewide population projection is shown in Attachment 2.

C. Public Safety and Emergency Services

There are over 75 law enforcement agencies within the state consisting of the State agencies, County Sheriff Departments, City Police Departments, and University and School District security departments.

The Fire Service at the state and local level consists of both paid and volunteer agencies. Statewide, there are over 150 (including the Nevada Division of Forestry) fire departments. Generally, paid fire agencies operate within the urban areas while volunteer departments function primarily in the rural areas. There are also numerous private industrial and federal fire departments which are not included in the above count.

In the Special Emergency Service, there are over 72 operating ambulance encies or companies using both land and air vehicles. A large number of nese ambulance services operate under a volunteer organization, especially in the rural areas. There are 21 in Las Vegas.

There are a hosts of other public service organizations covering a wide variety of activities but they are to many to list. These include numerous other state and local government service agencies, such as wildlife, highway maintenance, public works, health, and emergency management.

Since much of the Nevada land area is controlled by the federal government, numerous federal agencies and the military operate extensively within the state requiring a variety of law enforcement, fire, medical, and other general services. The major federal agencies are the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Department of Energy, Navy, Army, and Air Force.

SPECTRUM ALLOTMENT METHODOLOGY

Element 5 asks for:

A general description of how the spectrum is to be allotted among the various eligible users within the region.

Region 27 has developed the following tasks that will provide a foundation for assignment of NPSPAC frequencies.
They are:

TASKS

1. Identify and define Region 27 eligibles

2. Identify Region 27 requirements for radio spectrum. (See Element 6)

3. Identify applications the NPSPAC frequencies will support. (Element 6)

4. Review the technical standards required by Docket 87-112.

5. Evaluate how the technical standards can meet identified requirements and applications.

6. Determine spectrum requirement needed to satisfy step 5, compare spectrum requirement with FCC allotment total to determine if spectrum demand exceeds FCC allotment or results in surplus.

7. Create required data base and justification for input to CET Packing Program for automated assignment of frequencies.

2.4 REQUIREMENTS ASSESSMENT

Planning element (6) asks for:

An explanation of how the requirements of all eligible entities within the region were considered and met to the degree possible.

The Region 27 Planning Committee defines all eligibles under section 2.1 of this Plan.

This planning element identifies the radio spectrum requirements and the applications of Region 27 eligibles.

This was accomplished by collecting the following data on every Region 27 eligible.

1. Systems inventory to include number of portables, mobiles, base stations, and repeater stations. (See Region 27 Supplementary Information support documentation to the Region 27 Plan.)

2. Service area, or coverage requirements.

3. Functions the radio system provides.

4. Interoperability Requirements. (See Region 27 Supplementary Information support documentation to the Region 27 Plan.

These data provided the following information on radio spectrum required by Region 27 users.

a. Adequate radio frequencies to support radio systems coverage of a geographical area.

b. Adequate channel capacity for both day to day usage and emergency operations.

c. Adequate frequency reserve for systems expansion.

d. Radio frequency support for inter/intra agency communications.

e. Number of users having similar or overlapping coverage needs.

The applications supported by radio frequencies are:

a. Mobile relay stations for wide area or extended coverage between mobile and portable units.

b. Mobile and portable radio communications with local and wide area dispatch points.

c. Paging of emergency responders.

d. Electronic data exchange between information systems and mobile data terminals.

e. Mobile/portable to mobile/portable operation for tactical operations support.

f. Unit tracking and location

g. Mobile/portable operation into the public switched network.

h. Telemetry networks

As supported by interoperability requirements data in the Region 27 Supplementary Information support documentation to the Region 27 Plan, all eligibles in Region 27 identified interoperability and shortage of radio frequencies as the major deficiency, among Region 27 eligibles.

Interoperability is currently limited by the variety of bands, limited channel capacity, bandwidwidth limitation, etc.

The Region 27 planning committee has identified the above requirements, applications, and interoperability as minimum needs to be met for <u>all</u> eligibles. Meeting these needs will result in increased benefits for many eligibles.

In Planning Element 9, these identified minimum requirements are listed as a decision factor which affects the allocation method.

2 - PRIORITIZATION PROCEDURES

Element (7) asks for:

An explanation as to how eligible entities have been prioritized in areas where not all can receive licenses;

At the present time in Region 27, *there is no demonstrated need to consider priorities to any significant degree* in the preparation of this plan. Sufficient 800 MHz channels exist in the allocation to satisfy the current and future requirements of all eligibles as defined in this plan.

In the event that prioritization becomes necessary, the RRC will utilize the following decision factors and point schedule to determine allocations.

Point Range		
(0-25)	(1)	spectrum usage as it applies to protection of life and property.
-15)	(2)	functional application of how the frequencies are to be used.
	(3)	technical application of how the frequencies are to be used applied to:
(0-15)	a.	service demands
(0-15)	b.	channel loading
(0-15)	c.	system design (to include common system or common mode of operation vs. conventional mode.
(0-15)	(4)	implementation schedule to include funding support.

NOTE: Allocations will be based on highest sum of totaled points taking all decision factors into account.

2.6 ADJACENT REGION COORDINATION PROCEDURES

Planning Element 8 asks for:

An explanation of how the plan has been coordinated with adjacent regions;

Adjacent regions to Region 27 are:

Region 3 - Arizona
Region 5 - Southern California
Region 6 - Northern California
Region 12 - Idaho
Region 35 - Oregon
Region 41 - Utah

There are two areas of the Region 27 Plan that require coordination with adjacent regions.

The first area is the frequency allotment process. The intent of the coordination is to insure minimal interference of co-channel assignments next to regional borders. This coordination process will also insure that eligible's radio coverage is properly engineered to avoid overlapping into the adjacent region.

The majority of this coordination is accomplished automatically through the CET Sort program that the FCC has recommended to accomplish the frequency packing. This program takes into account the radio frequencies and their assigned areas in adjacent regions during the packing program.

In addition, a copy of the completed plan has been sent to each region with a request to review and concur with its contents. The letters of concurrence are provided in attachment 9.

The second area of importance is guidelines surrounding usage of mutual aid channels. Public safety agencies in bordering jurisdictions must communicate with each other. Therefore it is important that mutual aid guidelines between adjacent regions, be similar. Section 3 of this plan will provide indepth information on how this coordination will be accomplished.

The State of Nevada, and the State of California has already accomplished this coordinated effort for frequencies in lower bands.

2.7 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SPECTRUM ALLOCATIONS

Planning Element 9 asks for:

A detailed explanation of how the plan puts the spectrum to the best possible use by:

a. requiring system design with minimum coverage areas

b. by assigning frequencies so that maximum frequency reuse and offset channel use may be made

c. by using trunking

d. by requiring small entities with minimal requirements to join together on a single system where possible

Many of these objectives are interrelated. In addition, how these objectives are addressed can be affected by the following considerations:

1. CET SORT Packing Plan
2. Current 800 MHz Trunked and Conventional Technologies
3. Current and future State and Local Government equipment loading inventories
4. Operational Concerns
5. Current communications Site locations and service areas
6. Economies of scale

The frequency allocation committee of Reg. 27 was tasked by the Region 27 Chairman to evaluate and review data and information which deals with both Element 9 objectives and the above stated considerations.

a. REQUIRING SYSTEM DESIGN WITH MINIMUM COVERAGE AREAS

As mentioned in element 5, Region 27 has many eligibles with radio service coverage requirements exceeding thousands of square miles. It has been recommended by the FCC for Region 27 to utilize the CET Sort packing plan which describes the sizes of service areas used to initiate the packing procedures.

The CET Sort packing plan is a computerized program designed to achieve the best spectral efficiency possible while protecting co-channel and adjacent channels from interference. The required number of channels is allocated based upon identified needs or population density referenced to a geographical area. This program can also meet transmitting combining requirements to support common system technical requirements.

Discussion

Both Element 9 objective a, and the CET SORT Packing plan deal with restricting system design to small service areas.

n addition information provided on the CET sort program states that the frequency sorting task being done is a geographic sort of frequencies, NOT A SYSTEM DESIGN. Therefore, the coordinates and range data tabulated should describe the geography and not necessarily be actual user antenna sites.

THIS CONCEPT IS NOT IN THE BEST INTEREST OF REGION 27.

It is not in the best interest to circlelitize a geopolitical region without considering the local geography.

This is because of extreme mountainous terrain, large, sparsely populated service area and high costs of communication site development. High level mountain-top radio sites are required to serve Nevada State and Local governments. Average service areas range from 30 to 60 miles from these sites.

Region 27 RPC recognizes that using high level sites makes it technically difficult to avoid overlapping coverage into adjacent regions. The CET sort program asks that an eligibles geopolitical coverage not exceed its

boundary by more than three miles. Region 27 RPC fully agrees with the intent of the CET sort program so that maximum frequency reuse will occur. However, since these established sites may support multiple cities, counties and state agency service requirements, and since Planning Element 9, part d requires common systems where possible, it appears that a combination of high level sites in a common mode of operation is beneficial to both Region 27 and the FCC. This would also mean that a geopolitical boundary does not become an issue in the frequency allocation process.

Conclusion

Requiring Region 27 to utilize smaller service areas would require Region 27 eligibles to establish new communications site facilities and have a severe economic impact on Nevada's governments. Costs pertaining to power distribution, facility development, road access and development are major factors for this decision.

The RPC concludes that Region 27 be allowed to utilize large service areas when employing common systems. The CET Sort Program can accommodate service areas of up to radius of 60 miles.

rojected growth/population figures to the year 2000 show that Region 27 can continue using large service area coverage and meet service demand for existing eligibles, and provide future allocations for growth, without requiring the full NPSPAC allocation.

The RPC agrees that systems implemented to serve single users, (provided that they cannot work on a common system) shall be required to minimize RF propagation outside an agencies primary area of service according to SORT guidelines. The RPC also concludes that a common system supporting multiple cities, counties and St. agencies not be bounded by jurisdictional lines. Therefore, where common systems are implemented, channels allocated will be a function of a geographical area and not a particular eligible.

b. BY ASSIGNING FREQUENCIES SO THAT MAXIMUM FREQUENCY REUSE AND OFFSET CHANNEL USE MAY BE MADE

Element 9 part b also relates to part a in that the question arises, " Would a system design with minimum coverage areas provide greater frequency reuse than system design with large coverage areas.? "

Discussion

As commented on in the preceding section, small service areas are not in the best interest to Region 27. Initial analysis shows that utilization of small service areas in Reg. 27 results in an increase of frequencies required to obtain the needed coverage for Reg. 27 eligibles. This is determined through the circlelization method used by the CET SORT Program.

Conclusion

Given the limited spectral resource available for use by Public Safety, Region 27 recognizes the need to achieve maximum utilization in the assignment process. Once the service areas are defined in a Region, the CET SORT program will insure that a frequency is reused at the earliest opportunity with minimal degradation to co-channel or adjacent channel assignments.

c. BY USING TRUNKING

One of two stated objectives in Docket 87-112 requires the utilization of spectral efficient technologies. Trunking is mentioned as a spectral ficient technology which can meet the requirements of public safety.

Discussion

The RPC did review current 800 technologies for features and benefits to insure that in a common mode of operation, individual agencies needs and requirements were met or exceeded with 800 MHz technologies as compared to current technologies, current systems and current requirements.

A critical issue noted by the RPC is that equipment standards were never established for 800 MHz radios. Therefore the level of inter-operability (the major identified deficiency in REG. 27 and major objective of Doc. 87-112) achieved between systems can vary from having total system access to being able only to talk in a simplex mode of operation. FCC decisions dealing with equipment standards stated that they are not necessary due to the interoperability channels established in DOC. 87-112.

Conclusion

Region 27 fully agrees that trunking is not only spectral efficient, but

-an provide features and benefits not presently available to most Nevada ligibles. However, if not properly coordinated, interoperability problems being currently experienced at VHF 150-170 MHz and UHF 450-470 MHz will be compounded by the implementation of 800 MHz systems. If properly coordinated the interoperability problem can be minimized. This is a issue that needs to be further addressed by the eligibles in REG 27 in addition to the requirements of DOC. 87-112.

Docket 87-112, paragraph 37 has set both the requirements and exceptions regarding trunking technologies. This plan shall follow those guidelines.

d. BY REQUIRING SMALL ENTITIES WITH MINIMAL REQUIREMENTS TO JOIN TOGETHER ON A SINGLE SYSTEM WHERE POSSIBLE.

Discussion:

There are two issues that must be addressed concerning this requirement. One is a technical issue, and one is a political issue.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

ıe following issues interrelate and must be addressed:

a. Current 800 MHz Trunked and Conventional Technologies

The Region 27 Planning Committee was tasked with using trunking technologies and requiring small entities to join together on common systems. Therefore, the RPC did review current 800 technologies for features and benefits to insure that in a common mode of operation, individual agencies needs and requirements were met or exceeded with 800 MHz technologies as compared to current technologies, current systems and current requirements.

In order to more accurately project minimum spectrum requirements for common mode systems, current inventories showing total mobiles and portable radios in Nevada were collected and reviewed.

b. Economies of scale

Docket 87-112 does not address the budgetary impact that a planning process of this type could cause. In addition, Region 27 realizes that the FCC's

responsibility in this process is one of insuring spectral efficiency while meeting operational requirements. However, Region 27 is required to utilize common systems where possible. In review of current state and local government operational practices, it is observed that the multiple individual systems that are currently in place are spectrally inefficient. It is not uncommon to have multiple individual systems each supporting an average of 3 to 20 mobile/portable units. At the same time, the users of these systems complain of the lack of interoperability between these systems. Because Region 27 is tasked with requiring a common mode of operation to small eligibles, it should be noted that economies and minimal budget impact can occur in common systems. In addition, features and benefits, such as interoperability, can more efficiently be offered in a common system as compared to an individual system. Therefore, it is in the interest of all users for the RPC to consider the issue of economies of common mode vs individual mode of operation.

Conclusion

The Region 27 Committee has reviewed current service area requirements, average daily loading within a service area, and shared facilities currently in place. It has taken the number of agencies served, number of channels currently required and compared this with a common system. If a common system is more spectrally efficient, has better interoperability and meets or exceeds an eligibles requirements, then a combined system has been recommended.

Review of 800 MHz trunked and conventional technologies show that these systems can support multiple users.

Political Issue

It is noted that requiring several small entities to work off a common system may cause political concerns to be raised. It is not the intent of the Region 27 Planning Committee to become embroiled in political matters should a common system be recommended to a user who does not desire to be part of a common system. Therefore, should this issue occur, the disagreeing party shall prepare a written report. This report and a report from the RRC shall be submitted for review and a decision by the FCC.

9 FREQUENCY REQUESTS AND COORDINATION

To ensure compliance with the Plan, any request for 800 Mhz frequencies to be used for public safety or special emergency operations (as described in Part 90 of the FCC rules and regulations) will be submitted to the Nevada APCO Frequency Advisor for processing and review by the RRC. The Advisor and the RRC shall review all applications to determine their compliance with the Regional Plan.

If approved by the RRC, the request will be returned to the applicant to be forwarded to the Associated Public Safety Communications Officers, Inc. (APCO) for frequency coordination in accordance with established procedures.

If not approved by the RRC, the request, with proper notations, will be returned to the applicant for revision and correction before being resubmitted to the Committee for further consideration and processing.

2.9 APPLICATION EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In order for the RRC to properly evaluate the request, all applications hall contain sufficient information to justify the frequencies requested and shall demonstrate compliance with the Plan. The information required includes the following:

A. Coordination and Licensing Application Forms

All applicants will be expected to fully and accurately complete the necessary forms. Each form shall be signed by an official of the requesting agency.

B. System Overview

A brief statement of the intended use of requested frequencies, a listing of the agency(ies) and/or departments that will utilized the system and how they will be integrated into existing emergency and non-emergency operations.